

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/896,228	WATSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin A. Ailes	2142	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Benjamin A. Ailes. (3) Harold Novick (26,011).
 (2) Stanley N. Protigal (28,657). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 February 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 16-20 and 27.


Identification of prior art discussed: Rao et al. (US 6,674,756 B1), Armstrong et al. (US 6,691,146 B1), Snay et al. (US 6,282,678 B1), Jourdenais et al. (US 5,278,986), Kurose et al. (US 2002/0035641 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ANDREW CALDWELL
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiner's Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.


Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Examiner Ailes and applicants' representatives Mr. Protigal and Mr. Novick discussed the issues as identified in the attached applicant initiated interview request form. The proposed claim amendments (see attached) were also reviewed and discussed in view of the prior art of record. No agreement with respect to the claims in view of the prior art was reached at this time. Examiner Ailes suggested to place all arguments with sufficient elaboration in a written response to the last office action. Mr. Protigal and Mr. Novick agreed to file a response and indicated that they would be filing an RCE. The examiner also reminded Mr. Protigal and Mr. Novick their obligation to record the substance of the interview as set forth in MPEP 713.04. The submitted "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form" and proposed claim amendments are attached.

BAA

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY DO NOT ENTER



PTOL-413A (10-07)
Approved for use through 10/31/2007. OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/896,228 First Named Applicant: Thomas Lee Watson
Examiner: Benjamin A. Ailes Art Unit: 2142 Status of Application: _____

Tentative Participants:

(1) Harold Novick (2) Stanley Protigal
(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: June 8

Proposed Time: 11:00 (AM/PM)

Alternative date June 9

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES

☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>35 US 0103</u>	<u>1, 27</u>	<u>Rao V. Armstrong</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>35 US 0103</u>	<u>16-20</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Claims attached

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature _____

Examiner/SPE Signature _____

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative _____

Registration Number, if applicable _____

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY
DO NOT ENTER

82722

Gary M. Nath (TX, NJ)*
Ross A. Epstein (CA)*
Joshua B. Goldberg (VA, DC)
Jerald L. Meyer (VA)
Robert P. Cogan (CA, DC)*

Harold L. Novick (DC, MD)*, Of Counsel

Gregory B. Kang (DC, NJ)*, On Sabbatical

Irvin A. Lavine, Retired
Donald M. Sandler, Retired

Patent, Trademark and Copyright Causes,
Unfair Competition, Trade Secrets,
Licensing and Litigation

THE NATH LAW GROUP
Attorneys at Law
112 S. West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
USA

TELEPHONE +01-703 548-6284
FACSIMILE +01-703 683-8396

E-MAIL: ip@nathlaw.com
WEB: www.nathlaw.com

Susanne M. Hopkins (VA)
Lee C. Heiman (CA)*
Tanya E. Harkins (MD)*
Charles D. Niebyski, Ph.D. (MD, DC)*
Sheldon M. McGee (DC)*
Derek Richmond (VA)
Stanley N. Protigal (DC)*
H. David Starr (DC, MD)*
Burman Y. Mathis, III (VA, DC)
Jonathan A. Kidney (MD, DC)*
Teresa M. Arroyo (MD)*
Ari G. Zytcer (IA)*
Alvin E. Tanenholtz**
Matthew J. Moffa**

*Practice limited to Matters and Proceedings before
Federal Courts and Agencies; not Admitted in VA

**Registered Patent Agent; not Admitted in VA

To: Examiner Ailes

From: Harold Novick, Stan Protigal

Fax: 571-273-3899

Pages:

Phone:

Date:

Re:

CC:

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply

Comments:

Re: S.N. 09/896,228, Thomas Lee Watson, et al.

Thank you for the helpful and courteous interview which you kindly granted to us today.

Attached is a copy of the revisions to claim 1 on which we agreed. We will also be cancelling claim 2.



SHOULD ANY DIFFICULTIES BE INCURRED WITH THE RECEIPT OF THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION (IN WHOLE OR IN PART), PLEASE CONTACT THE SENDER AT THE ABOVE TELEPHONE NUMBER FOR RETRANSMISSION. The information contained in this facsimile communication is: **ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL** and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication or any portion of it by anyone other than the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If this communication is received in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY
DO NOT ENTER

Attorney Docket No. 82722

In re patent application of:

Thomas Lee Watson, et al.

Conf. No. 9439

Filed: June 29, 2001

Examiner: AILES, Benjamin A.

Serial No. 09/896,228

Art Unit: 2142

For: **SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ROUTER VIRTUAL NETWORKING****PROPOSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891
Tel: 703-548-6284
Fax: 703-683-8396

Harold L. Novick
Registration No. 26,011
Stanley N. Protigal
Registration No. 27,658

1. (currently amended) A system of virtual router domains comprising:

a host router ~~running a common operating system and a~~ including a master control processor ~~running a common operating system~~, said host router having a plurality of multiple virtual networking (v-net) domains providing separate routing tables used internally from externally visible routes;

said v-net domains having unique domain ID addresses, said v-net domains logically partitioned within said router, and said v-net domains capable of running under independent processes by use of replica arrays of a plurality of global variables;

the host master control processor having a capability of running the plural independent processes and routing application copies corresponding to the independent processes, but sharing said common operating system ; a plurality of virtual router domains established by ones of said independent processes, the virtual router domains logically partitioned within said host router, each said virtual router domain having a unique domain ID address and an independent replica array of all global variables across said common operating system, each said process running in a said virtual router domain independently of all other said virtual router domains on top of said common operating system; and

said global variables being accessed by macro references in each said virtual router domain.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Sent By: NATH & ASSOCIATES;

703 683 8383;

Feb-6-08 16:45;

Page 1/2

DONOT ENTER

Gary M. Nath (DC, MD)*

Ross A. Epstein (CA)*

Joshua B. Goldberg (VA, DC)

Jerald L. Meyer (VA)

Robert P. Cogan (CA, DC)*

Harold L. Novick (DC, MD)* Of Counsel

Gregory B. Kang (DC, NY)* On Sabbatical

Irvin A. Lavine, Retired

Donald M. Sandler, Retired

Patent, Trademark and Copyright Causes,
Unfair Competition, Trade Secrets,
Licensing and Litigation

THE NATH LAW GROUP

Attorneys at Law

112 S. West Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

USA

TELEPHONE +01-703 548-6284

FACSIMILE +01-703 683-8396

E-MAIL: lp@nathlaw.com

WEB: www.nathlaw.com

Susanne M. Hopkins (VA)

Lee C. Heiman (CA)*

Tanya E. Harkins (MD)*

Charles D. Niebylski, Ph.D. (MD, DC)*

Sheldon M. McGee (DC)*

Derek Richmond (VA)

Stanley N. Protigal (DC)*

H. David Starr (DC, MD)*

Burman Y. Mathis, III (VA, DC)

Jonathan A. Kidney (MD, DC)*

Teresa M. Arroyo (MD)*

Ari G. Zytcer (CA)*

Alvin E. Tanenholtz**

Matthew J. Moffa**

*Practice limited to Matters and Proceedings before
Federal Courts and Agencies; not Admitted in VA

**Registered Patent Agent; not Admitted in VA

To: Ex. Ailes

From:

Fax:

Pages:

Phone:

Date:

Re:

CC:

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply

Comments:

Re: S.N. 09/896,228, Thomas Lee Watson, et al.

Attached is a revision of our proposed claim amendments for discussion.

SHOULD ANY DIFFICULTIES BE INCURRED WITH THE RECEIPT OF THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION (IN WHOLE OR IN PART), PLEASE CONTACT THE SENDER AT THE ABOVE TELEPHONE NUMBER FOR RETRANSMISSION. The information contained in this facsimile communication is: **ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL** and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication or any portion of it by anyone other than the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If this communication is received in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY
DO NOT ENTER

Attorney Docket No. 82722

In re patent application of:

Thomas Lee Watson, et al.

Conf. No. 9439

Filed: June 29, 2001

Examiner: AILES, Benjamin A.

Serial No. 09/896,228

Art Unit: 2142

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ROUTER VIRTUAL NETWORKING

PROPOSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS FOR DISCUSSION

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891
Tel: 703-548-6284
Fax: 703-683-8396

Harold L. Novick
Registration No. 26,011
Stanley N. Protigal
Registration No. 27,658

1. (currently amended) A system of virtual router domains comprising:

a master control processor running a common operating system;

a host router ~~running a common operating system and a~~ including said master control processor, said host router having a plurality of multiple virtual networking (v-net) domains providing separate routing tables used internally from externally visible routes; ^{redundant?} ^{what does this mean?}

said v-net domains having unique domain ID addresses, said v-net domains logically partitioned within said router, and said v-net domains capable of running under independent processes by use of replica arrays of a plurality of global variables; ^{IP #'s}

the ~~host~~ master control processor having a capability of running the plural independent processes and routing application copies corresponding to the independent processes, but sharing said common operating system; ~~a plurality of virtual router domains established by ones of said independent processes, the virtual router domains logically partitioned within said host router, each said virtual router domain having a unique domain ID address and an independent replica array of all global variables across said common operating system, each said process running in a said virtual router domain independently of all other said virtual router domains on top of said common operating system; and~~

said global variables being accessed by macro references in each said virtual router domain.



ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY
DO NOT ENTER

Attorney Docket No. 82722

In re patent application of:

Thomas Lee Watson, et al.

Conf. No. 9439

Filed: June 29, 2001

Examiner: AILES, Benjamin A.

Serial No. 09/896,228

Art Unit: 2142

For: **SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ROUTER VIRTUAL NETWORKING**

PROPOSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS FOR DISCUSSION

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891
Tel: 703-548-6284
Fax: 703-683-8396

Harold L. Novick
Registration No. 26,011
Stanley N. Protigal
Registration No. 27,658

1. (currently amended) A system of virtual router domains comprising:

a host router running a common operating system and a master control processor implemented in multiple virtual networking (v-net) domains capable of separating route tables used internally from externally visible routes;

the host having a capability of running plural independent processes and routing application copies corresponding to the independent processes, but sharing said common operating system;

a plurality of virtual router each of at least a subset of said v-net domains running DRP and SNMP processes, and establishing virtual routers, thereby establishing said v-net domains established by ones of said independent processes, the virtual-router v-net domains logically partitioned into ones of said v-net domains within said host router, each said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain having a unique v-net domain ID address and an independent replica array of all global variables across said common operating system, each said process running in a said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain independently of all other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains on top of said common operating system; and

said global variables ~~being~~ accessed by macro references in each said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain.

DO NOT ENTER

2. (previously presented) The system of claim 1 wherein said common operating system runs on the master control processor within said host router.

3. (original) The system of claim 2 wherein said common operating system is a version of FreeBSD.

4. (currently amended) The system of claim 1 wherein said common operating system manages the reporting of hardware failures across all ~~virtual router~~ v-net domains of said host router.

5. (original) The system of claim 1 wherein said plurality of processes comprise routing software applications.

6. (original) The system of claim 5 wherein said plurality of processes comprise independent plural identical copies of at least one said process.

7. (original) The system of claim 5 wherein said plurality of processes comprise a copy of a dynamic routing protocol (DRP) software application.

8. (original) The system of claim 1 wherein said plurality of processes comprise a copy of a SNMP application.

9. (currently amended) The system of claim 1 wherein said macros generate an array of said global variables when said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain is configured in.

10. (currently amended) The system of claim 9 wherein said macros generate scalar global variables when said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain is deconfigured.

11. (currently amended) The system of claim 1 further comprising a plurality of interfaces partitioned interchangeably among said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domains, such that a

DO NOT ENTER

particular interface is associated with only one such ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain at one time, but can be repartitioned among said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains to reconfigure said host router.

12. (original) The system of claim 11 wherein during said reconfiguring network traffic is removed from said interfaces that are repartitioned.

13. (currently amended) The system of claim 11 wherein said interface contains the unique domain ID address of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain with which said interface is associated.

14. (original) The system of claim 13 wherein said interface is an interface port of said host router.

15. (original) The system of claim 14 wherein said host router comprises at least 320 said interface ports.

16. (currently amended) The system of claim 14 further comprising a socket created by at least one said process, said socket being associated exclusively with the ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain in which it is created and containing said unique domain ID address of said domain in which it is created.

17. (currently amended) The system of claim 16 wherein multiple sockets are created by said at least one process in at least one said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain, such that each of said multiple sockets is associated exclusively with the ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain in which said socket is created.

18. (currently amended) The system of claim 17 wherein said at least one process is movable from one said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain to a different said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain, such that said at least one process creates a said socket in each of at least two said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains.

DO NOT ENTER

19. (currently amended) The system of claim 17 wherein a particular socket associated with a particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain is applied exclusively to live traffic networking independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

20. (currently amended) The system of claim 17 wherein a particular socket associated with a particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain is applied exclusively to a test bed operation independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

21. (currently amended) The system of claim 16 wherein each of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains maintains an independent routing table.

22. (currently amended) The system of claim 21 wherein each said socket uses the routing table of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain in which said socket is created.

23. (currently amended) The system of claim 21 wherein said two distinct ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains use the same Internet Protocol (IP) addresses without conflicting.

24. (currently amended) The system of claim 21 wherein one particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain within said host router contains routing tables exclusively for internal interface addresses within said host router independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

25. (currently amended) The system of claim 21 wherein a particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain within said host router contains routing tables exclusively for interfaces externally visible from outside said host router independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

26. (currently amended) The system of claim 21 wherein a failure of one of said plurality of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains does not adversely affect a different one of said plurality of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains.

DO NOT ENTER

27. (currently amended) A method of logically partitioning a host router into virtual router domains, comprising:

configuring the kernel of a single common operating system running in said host router implemented in multiple virtual networking (v-net) domains capable of separating route tables used internally from externally visible routes;

configuring at least one independent process and application copy corresponding to the independent process to run on said host router, in a manner to permit running a plurality of said independent processes and routing application copies corresponding to the independent processes, but sharing said common operating system;

configuring ~~a plurality of virtual router~~ each of at least a subset of said v-net domains running DRP and SNMP processes, and establishing virtual routers, thereby establishing said v-net domains established by ones of said independent processes within said host router;

identifying each said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain by a unique domain index number;

generating an independent identical set of replica arrays of global variables for each ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain; and

associating a process with each said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain of said host router, such that said processes run in said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domains independently of one another on top of said single common operating system of said host router using a master control processor.

~~a plurality of virtual router~~ each of at least a subset of said v-net domains running DRP and SNMP processes, and establishing virtual routers, thereby establishing said v-net domains established by ones of said independent processes, the virtual router v-net domains logically partitioned into ones of said v-net domains within said host router, each said virtual router v-net domain having a unique v-net domain ID address and an independent replica array of all global variables across said common operating system, each said process running in a said virtual router v-net domain independently of all other said virtual router v-net domains on top of said common operating system; and

28. (original) The method of claim 27 wherein said global variables are generated by macros.

DO NOT ENTER

29. (currently amended) The method of claim 28 wherein said macros generate arrays of global variables when said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain is configured in within said host router.

30. (currently amended) The method of claim 29 wherein said macros generate scalar global variables when said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain is deconfigured.

31. (previously presented) The method of claim 27 wherein said single common operating system runs on the master control processor within said host router.

32. (original) The method of claim 31 wherein said single common operating system is a version of FreeBSD.

33. (original) The method of claim 27 wherein said processes comprise routing software applications.

34. (original) The method of claim 33 further comprising independently running plural identical copies of at least one said process.

35. (original) The method of claim 33 wherein said processes comprise a copy of a dynamic routing protocol (DRP) software application.

36. (original) The method of claim 27 wherein each said process manages an instantiation of a common networking code.

37. (currently amended) The method of claim 27 further comprising partitioning a plurality of host router interfaces interchangeably among said ~~virtual router~~ v-net domains, such that a particular interface is associated with only one such ~~virtual router~~ v-net domain at one time.

DO NOT ENTER

38. (currently amended) The method of claim 37 further comprising repartitioning said plurality of interfaces among said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains, such that said host router is reconfigured.

39. (original) The method of claim 38 wherein during said reconfiguring network traffic is removed from said interfaces that are repartitioned.

40. (currently amended) The method of claim 37 wherein said interface contains the unique domain index number of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain with which said interface is associated.

41. (original) The method of claim 40 wherein said interface is an interface port of said host router.

42. (original) The method of claim 41 wherein said host router comprises at least 320 said interface ports.

43. (currently amended) The method of claim 41 wherein said process creates a socket, such that said socket is associated permanently and exclusively with the ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain in which it is created and containing said unique domain index number of said domain in which it is created.

44. (currently amended) The method of claim 43 wherein multiple sockets are created by at least one said process in at least one said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain, such that each of said multiple sockets is associated permanently and exclusively with the ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain in which said socket is created.

45. (currently amended) The method of claim 44 further comprising moving said at least one process from one said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain to a different said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain, such that said at least one process creates a said socket in each of at least two said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains.

DO NOT ENTER

46. (currently amended) The method of claim 44 wherein said process maintains a file descriptor table containing pointers to said sockets associated with said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain.

47. (currently amended) The method of claim 46 wherein a particular socket associated with a particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain is applied exclusively to live traffic networking independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

48. (currently amended) The method of claim 46 wherein a particular socket associated with a particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain is applied exclusively to a test bed operation independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

49. (currently amended) The method of claim 43 wherein each of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains maintains an independent routing table.

50. (currently amended) The method of claim 49 wherein each said socket uses the routing table of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain in which said socket is created.

51. (currently amended) The method of claim 49 wherein said two distinct ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains use the same Internet Protocol (IP) addresses without conflicting.

52. (currently amended) The method of claim 49 wherein one particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain within said host router contains routing tables exclusively for internal interface addresses within said host router independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

53. (currently amended) The method of claim 49 wherein a particular ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain within said host router contains routing tables exclusively for interfaces externally visible from outside said host router independently of any other said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domain of said host router.

54. (currently amended) The method of claim 49 wherein a failure of one of said plurality of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains does not adversely affect a different one of said plurality of said ~~virtual-router~~ v-net domains.